

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 3, 4, 8, and 9. These sheets, which includes Figs. 3, 4, 8, and 9, replaces the original sheets including Figs. 3, 4, 8, and 9.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Remarks

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated February 06, 2009. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 15 have been amended and claims 17-20 have been added. The specification and Figs. 3, 4, 8, and 9 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the present amendment.

Drawings and Specification

The specification and Figs. 3, 4, 8, and 9 have been amended in response to the Examiner's objections. Some of the reference numerals in Figs. 8 and 9 have been changed to their corresponding numerals for similar elements in Figs. 3-7. The panes, insulating member, and cavities in Figs. 8 and 9 have been changed to match those of Fig. 3 due to their similar descriptions. The panes of Figs. 5-7 have a more broad description and are considered to be a separate embodiment, and have therefore been left with their original numerals. The mounting surfaces of Figs. 8 and 9 have been changed to match those of Figs. 5-7 due to the similar configuration of the extrusions 70 and 50. The configuration of extrusion 20 in Fig. 3 does not match those in Figs. 5-9 and therefore the numerals of the mounting surfaces of Fig. 3 have been left unchanged. The magnetized gasket in Fig. 9 has been changed to match the one in Fig. 3, however since extrusion 20 does not match extrusion 70, the retaining grooves maintain their separate numerals.

The perforations between mounting surfaces defined in claim 6 have been pointed out and clarified in Figs. 4 and 8 and a description of the perforations has been added to the specification. The perforations were already present in Figs. 4 and 8 and described in claim 6 in the application as filed, therefore no new matter has been added. Also, numeral 43 has been removed from Fig. 3.

Accordingly, it is believed by the Applicant that all of the Examiner's objections have been addressed, Applicant therefore requests that the objections to the drawings and specification be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-4 and 13-16 have been rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,886,297 to Crandell, hereinafter "*Crandell*." Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1, as amended, recites that the frame is rigid and has an open center and defines a continuous periphery of the panel. It also recites that the frame has a uniform cross-sectional profile that forms a series of parallel, spaced apart mounting surfaces. The mounting surfaces are arranged about an inner periphery of the panel open center in a stepwise manner connected by substantially perpendicular risers. The mounting surfaces enable walls with sequentially larger areas to be inserted into the frame one after another.

Crandell does not teach mounting surfaces that are arranged about an inner periphery of the panel open center in a stepwise manner connected by substantially perpendicular risers. Rather, *Crandell* teaches a frame with grooves 114, 116, and 118 to receive the walls, making it necessary to keep the frame in an open and non-continuous position, as in Figure 3, when assembling the frame, and then closing the frame around the walls. In contrast, the walls of the invention of claim 1 can be inserted into the completed frame without need for further steps. The step arrangement of the mounting surfaces in the claimed invention therefore more easily allows a fast production process with less alignment and fitting complications.

Claim 15, as amended, recites constructing a continuous peripheral frame in step c) and fitting the walls onto the frame's mounting surfaces. As described above, *Crandell* inserts his walls into the frame when the frame is in an open, non-continuous position, like in Fig. 3.

Claims 2-4 and 13-14 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 as well as for their individual limitations. Similarly, claim 16 depends from claim 15 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 15 as well as its own limitation. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4 and 13-16 are not anticipated by *Crandell* and requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) to said claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-8 and 13-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,401,399 to Roche, hereinafter "*Roche*" in view of *Crandell*. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Roche does not teach the invention of claim 1, as amended. *Roche* does not have a series of parallel, spaced apart mounting surfaces arranged about an inner periphery of a panel open center in a stepwise manner connected by substantially perpendicular risers. The mounting surfaces are also not arranged in a cascading series such that the area of the walls diminish in one direction. As discussed above, *Crandell* does not teach these features, and *Roche* does not overcome these deficiencies in teaching the claimed invention. *Roche* also does not enable walls of sequentially larger areas to be inserted into the frame one after another, as the frame (F) is injection molded around the walls in a single step.

Claim 15 is similarly not taught by *Roche* in view of *Crandell* for reasons similar to those described in response to the 102(e) rejection to *Crandell*. *Roche* does not rectify the deficiencies of *Crandell* in teaching the claimed invention, particularly fitting the walls into a constructed peripheral frame.

Claims 2-8 and 13-14 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for their individual limitations. Claim 16 is dependent from claim 15 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 15, as well as for its own limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 and

13-16 are patentable over *Roche* in view of *Crandell* and requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to said claims.

Claims 9-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Roche* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,910,083 to Richardson, hereinafter "*Richardson*." Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claims 9-12 ultimately depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as above. *Richardson* does not rectify the deficiencies of *Crandell* and *Roche* in teaching the invention of claim 1. Particularly, *Richardson* does not teach that the mounting surfaces are parallel, spaced apart, and arranged in a stepwise manner connected by substantially perpendicular risers. Also, *Richardson* does not teach sequentially larger walls, but rather two same-sized walls in a row, 54 and 56.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-12 are patentable over *Roche* in view of *Richardson* and requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to said claims.

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

The Petition fee of \$555.00 is being charged to Deposit Account No. 02-3978 via electronic authorization submitted concurrently herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Ross Campbel McKinlay

By /John E. Nemazi/

John E. Nemazi

Reg. No. 30,876

Attorney for Applicant

Date: August 6, 2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351